

**REMARKS**

The 30 June 2004 official action addressed claims 1-29. Claims 1, 6, 12 and 21 are amended. Claims 5, 15 and 24 are canceled. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23 and 25-29 are pending for reconsideration.

**1. Overview of amendments**

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the feature formerly recited in claim 5 concerning a qualified keyword tool provided in a user interface.

Claim 5 is canceled.

Independent claims 12 and 21 have been amended to clarify that a user provides input indicating that a category of a hierarchy is to be added to or deleted from a viewer profile. Claims 12 and 21 have also been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, by incorporating the qualified keyword features of claims 15 and 24 respectively.

Claims 15 and 24 are canceled.

No new matter is added.

**2. Response to objections and rejections****Claims 1-4 and 5-11**

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Eick. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the qualified key word feature of claim 5, which was rejected over the combination of Eick and Lee. The combination of these references does not teach this feature.

As amended, claim 1 specifies a user interface that includes:

a qualified keyword tool for receiving input from a user associating a keyword supplied by the user with a specific category of the category hierarchy to indicate that the keyword describes subject matter of interest to the viewer only when that subject

matter is also described by the category associated with the qualified keyword

In other words, the user interface includes a tool that allows the user to associate a keyword with a specific category, so that the keyword is only effective with respect to that category. To give a practical example, the keyword "Giants" could refer to either the baseball Giants or the football Giants. By associating the keyword "Giants" with the category "baseball," the keyword is qualified in a manner that makes it only relevant to baseball content. This allows the user to more accurately focus the viewer profile on content of interest.

The rejection of claim 1 noted that Eick's navigation tool allows a user to navigate among categories and select a category, resulting in the display of a list of programs matching that category. The rejection of claim 5 referred back to the rejection of claim 2, which noted that Lee's user interface allows a user to add keywords from a selected program to a list of keywords in the user's profile. The rejection of claim 5 also declined to give any limiting weight to the term "qualified" and stated that a qualified keyword is still a keyword.

Applicants disagree with the position taken concerning the term qualified since it is inconsistent with the description of the claimed invention provided in the application, but believe this disagreement is overcome by the present clarifying amendments, which recite a tool for associating a keyword supplied by the user with a category of a category hierarchy.

Applicants submit that claim 1 as amended recites subject matter that is not obvious from the cited combination of references. Eick allows a user to navigate through a hierarchy of categories, but Eick does not utilize keywords. Lee allows a user to add the keywords of a particular program to the user's keyword list, and separately Lee allows a user to indicate whether the user likes or dislikes certain categories of content (represented as "beads"). However Lee does not allow the user to limit keywords by associating them with specific categories to form a qualified keyword. Nothing in either reference allows a user to associate a keyword with a specific category in a category hierarchy.

Therefore the cited references lack the feature of the qualified keyword tool required by claim 1. There is no motivation for this feature in either of the references because there is no explicit suggestion to provide this feature and no implied suggestion to provide this feature. Therefore the differences between claim 1 and the cited are involve features that would not have been obvious from those references. Applicants therefore request allowance of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

#### **Claims 12-20 and 21-29**

Claim 12 was rejected over the combination of Eick and Lee. Claim 12 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1 by incorporating the qualified keyword feature described above. Claim 12 is also amended to specify that the system receives input indicating whether a category to which the user has navigated is to be added to or deleted from a viewer profile that represents subject matter of interest to the viewer, and to specify that data representing a plurality of categories selected by the user and qualified keywords specified by the user are stored in the viewer profile.

In the rejection of claim 12, the official action referred to the rejection of claim 1, which noted Eick's navigation tool that allows a user to navigate among categories and select a category, resulting in the display of a list of programs matching that category. The official action also referred to Lee at col. 7, lines 11-18, which state that a client device includes a mass storage device that can store information about the user's preferences.

As discussed with respect to claim 1, the cited references do not describe the features of receiving input that associates a keyword with a category such that the keyword is only effective with respect to that category, or storing such qualified keywords in a viewer profile. Therefore claim 12 and its dependent claims are also allowable on this basis. Similar limitations are found in claim 21 and its dependent claims, and those claims are also allowable on that basis.

The foregoing amendments and remarks address all bases for rejection and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 29 September 04  
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number 23392  
Telephone: (310) 277-2223  
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

By Ronald Coslick  
Ronald Coslick  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,489